

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0174 (3720.Palm)

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 16 and 28 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-25 and 28 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 13, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lebby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,618) in view of Failla (U.S. Patent No. 5,128,662).

The Examiner indicated that Lebby et al. discloses all the claim limitations of independent claims 1 and 28 except for that the display system can be expanded from an initial or compact state to a larger visual display size such as disclosed by Lebby et al.. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 and 28 have been amended. Independent claims 1 and 28 include the limitation that “the visual display unit being useable in a compact state when attached to the processing unit.” (Claim 1), and “displaying information on a visual display unit in a compact state when coupled to a handheld computer” (Claim 28). Applicants respectfully submit that Lebby et al. and Failla, alone or in any proper combination do not disclose, teach or suggest all the claim limitations of amended independent claims 1 and 28. Applicants respectfully submit that the visual display unit being useable in a compact state when attached to the processing unit and the visual display unit being useable in an expanded state when detached from the processing unit is not disclosed in any combination of Lebby et al. and Failla. Failla

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0174 (3720.Palm)

shows that a display unit can be unfolded and used in an unfolded state with a processing unit. However, what is not taught or disclosed by Failla is that the display unit can be used in a compacted state while coupled to the processing unit, while at the same time being useable in the expanded state when detached from the processing unit. It is this functionality which is advantageous for a handheld computing device.

Further, no combination of Lebby et al. and Failla provides any motivation to combine the teachings of the two to arrive at Applicants' invention. In fact, Failla discusses that the expandable display screen can be stored for traveling in the compacted state. Accordingly, Failla did not contemplate the desirability of using the display in the compacted state with a portable electronic device and also having the ability to expand the display and separate the display from the electronic device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 28 and their respective dependent claims are therefore allowable.

In section 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, 10-12, 16-20, and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliwa (U.S. Patent No. 4,856,088) in view of Lebby et al. and further in view of Failla. Again, for the same reasons as discussed with regard to independent claims 1 and 28 above, no combination of Oliwa, Lebby et al. and Failla discloses, teaches, or suggests all the claim limitations of independent claims 1, 16, and 28. Independent claim 16 has been amended to include a limitation similar to those incorporated into claims 1 and 28 which is, "the visual display unit is useable in the compact state when attached to the handheld computing device." Accordingly, because the teachings of Lebby et al., Oliwa, and Failla do not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claim limitations of independent claims 1, 16 and 28 and further do not provide any motivation for the combination of Oliwa, Lebby et al., and Failla. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 16, and 28 are therefore allowable. Further, claims depending from claims 1, 16, and 28 are also allowable.

* * * * *

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0174 (3720.Palm)

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 10, 2005

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,603